



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/575,697

04/12/2006

Carsten Olsen

10442.204-US

2080

25908 7590 06/24/2009
NOVOZYMES NORTH AMERICA, INC.
500 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 1600
NEW YORK, NY 10110

EXAMINER

DESAI, ANAND U

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1656

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/24/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Patents-US-NY@novozymes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/575,697	Applicant(s) OLSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner ANAND U. DESAI	Art Unit 1656	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 50-57 and 59-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 61-63 and 68-70 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 50,55-57,59,60,64-67,71 and 72 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 51 and 54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 52 and 53 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on March 2, 2009. Claim 58 has been cancelled. New claims 71 and 72 have been added.
2. Claims 55-57, 59, and 60 are no longer withdrawn based upon further review of the restriction requirement and the election of species requirement. The claims are drawn to the encompassed elected invention. Claims 61-63 and 68-70 have been withdrawn previously.
3. Claims 50-57, 59, 60, 64-67, 71, and 72 are currently pending and are under examination.

Withdrawal of Rejections

4. The rejection of claims 50-54, 64, 65, and 67 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,762,040 B2 is withdrawn based on the amendment to the present claims to describe the conditionally essential gene as encoding an enzyme from the biosynthetic pathway of an amino acid.
5. The rejection of claim 64 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is withdrawn based on the amendment to the claims.
6. The rejection of claims 58-60 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is withdrawn based on the amendment to the claims.
7. The rejection of claims 50-54, 64, 65, and 67 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rasmussen (U.S. Patent 6,762,040 B2) is withdrawn based on the amendment to the claims.

Art Unit: 1656

Pending Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 2nd Paragraph

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
10. In claim 51, it is unclear how the bacterial cell can be anything other than a prokaryotic cell.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 1st Paragraph

11. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claim is rejected because of undue experimentation to practice the claimed invention for the genus of enzymes. The undue experimentation arises due to the unpredictability of the enzymes to actually be involved/from the biosynthetic pathway of an amino acid.

Art Unit: 1656

In *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988) eight factors should be addressed in determining enablement.

While the analysis and conclusion of a lack of enablement are based on the factors discussed in MPEP § 2164.01(a) and the evidence as a whole, it is not necessary to discuss each factor in the written enablement rejection. The language should focus on those factors, reasons, and evidence that lead the examiner to conclude that the specification fails to teach how to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation, or that the scope of any enablement provided to one skilled in the art is not commensurate with the scope of protection sought by the claims. This can be done by making specific findings of fact, supported by the evidence, and then drawing conclusions based on these findings of fact. For example, doubt may arise about enablement because information is missing about one or more essential parts or relationships between parts which one skilled in the art could not develop without undue experimentation. In such a case, the examiner should specifically identify what information is missing and why one skilled in the art could not supply the information without undue experimentation. See MPEP § 2164.06(a). References should be supplied if possible to support a prima facie case of lack of enablement, but are not always required. *In re Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 224, 169 USPQ 367, 370 (CCPA 1971). However, specific technical reasons are always required.

1) The nature of the invention: the instant claims are directed to a bacterial host cell comprising at least two amplified copies of an amplification unit, wherein the amplification unit comprises at least one copy of a gene of interest and an expressible conditionally essential gene,

Art Unit: 1656

wherein the conditionally essential gene encodes an enzyme from the biosynthetic pathway of an amino acid.

3) The predictability or unpredictability of the art: & 6) The quantity of experimentation necessary: & 7.) The state of the prior art: the prior art has shown which enzymes are involved in the biosynthetic pathway of amino acids. Claim 54 is drawn to enzymes that are not involved in the biosynthesis of amino acids. Therefore, the unpredictability arises due inability of some enzymes to actually be involved in the synthesis of amino acids.

Consequently, there would be a large quantity of experimentation necessary to determine what conditions would allow the enzymes claimed to be capable of synthesizing the amino acids.

4) The amount of direction or guidance presented: & 5) The presence or absence of working examples: the specification is devoid of any examples where the enzymes claimed would be capable of synthesizing the amino acids encompassed by the elected invention.

8.) Level of skill in the art: the level of skill in this art is high, at least that of a doctoral scientist with several years of experience in the art.

In consideration of the Wands factors, it is apparent that there is undue experimentation because of variability in prediction of outcome that is not addressed by the present application disclosure, examples, teaching, and guidance presented. Absent factual data to the contrary, the amount and level of experimentation needed is undue.

Conclusion

13. Claims 50, 55-57, 59, 60, 64-67, 71, and 72 are allowable.

14. Claims 51 and 54 are rejected.

Art Unit: 1656

15. Claims 52 and 53 are objected for depending on a rejected claim 51.
16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANAND U. DESAI whose telephone number is (571)272-0947. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Wang can be reached on (571)272-0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1656

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

June 18, 2009

/ANAND U DESAI/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656